



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,794	08/04/2003	Hui-Jen Tsai	8964-000004/US	5554
30596 7590 08/28/2008 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O.BOX 8910 RESTON, VA 20195				
EXAMINER BERTOGLIO, VALARIE E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1632				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/28/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/632,794

**Applicant(s)**

TSAI, HUAJEN

**Examiner**

Valarie Bertoglio

**Art Unit**

1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) 1 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 August 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1448 or PTO-600) Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's reply dated 06/17/2008 has been received. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are cancelled. Claim 7 is amended and pending in the instant office action.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 7 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term "operably" is misspelled at line 9. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112-2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendments to, or cancellation of, the claims.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1) Claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsiao et al. [2001] in view of Carvan et al [2000] and further in view of Finley et al, [Biotechniques, 31:66-72, July 2001]. The rejection is maintained for reasons of record set forth at pages 11-12 of the office action dated 03/03/2006 (note the rejection was applied to claims 3 and 7 at page 7 of the office action dated 03/23/2007).

The rejection of claim 3 is rendered moot by the cancellation of the claims.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the claim requires that the zebrafish be suitable for ornamental use and that Time Magazine reported the fish to be one of the coolest inventions of 2003.

These arguments are not persuasive. The claim is a product by process claim. The rejection relies on the teachings of Hsiao regarding a transgenic zebrafish that differs from that claimed only in that Hsiao does not teach use of a golden strain fish and the fluorescent protein encoded by the otherwise identical transgene construct is a GFP, as opposed to the claimed DsRed. These deficiencies are met by Carvan, who taught the availability and usefulness of golden zebrafish in making transgenics and by Finley who taught the use, and interchangeability, of a variety of genes encoding different colored fluorescent proteins. Applicant now relies on an intended use of the claimed fish as ornamental to establish novelty. While the art did not teach that the fish could be viewed as ornamental, zebrafish are sold by pet stores and can be considered as ornamental. Just as wildtype zebrafish are commercially sold, transgenic GFP expressing fish can be commercially sold, as can a fish derived by combining the teachings of Hsiao, Carvan and Finley. Nevertheless, the intended use of the fish fails to impart patentable weight on the product itself. Intended use recitations and other types of functional language

cannot be entirely disregarded. However, in apparatus, article, and composition claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. In re Casey 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 312 F.2d 937, 938, 136 USPQ 458, 459, (CCPA 1963). There appears to be nothing in the definition of “suitable for ornamental use” that indicates any type of structural difference between that which is claimed and that which what would be obtained by carrying out the exact teachings of Hsiao in a golden mutant strain using a DsRed encoding gene rather than a GFP encoding gene.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Valarie Bertoglio whose telephone number is (571) 272-0725. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 5:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Paras can be reached on (571) 272-4517. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Valarie Bertoglio, Ph.D./  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1632

